

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the present amendment and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, 5, and 7-14 are pending. In the present amendment, Claim 1 is currently amended, Claim 6 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and new Claims 10-14 are added. Support for the present amendment can be found in the original specification, for example, at page 9, line 23 to page 10, line 13, at page 19, line 9 to page 23, line 1, and in Figures 4-6. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 5, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Unruh (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0162395) in view of Dow et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,038,717, hereinafter “Dow”), Nakae et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0166829, hereinafter “Nakae”), and Mak (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0085289); Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Unruh, Dow, Nakae, and Mak, and further in view of Harada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,476, hereinafter “Harada”); Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Unruh, Dow, Nakae, and Mak, and further in view of Shiono et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0188001, hereinafter “Shiono”) and Fleck et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,977,811, hereinafter “Fleck”); Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Unruh, Dow, Nakae, and Mak, and further in view of Davies (U.S. Patent No. 6,799,303); and Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Unruh, Dow, Nakae, and Mak, and further in view of Blumberg (U.S. Patent No. 6,799,303).

In response to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these rejections and traverse these rejections, as discussed below.

Initially, it is noted that Claim 1 is hereby amended to include the subject matter from Claim 6. Thus, amended Claim 1 recites, in part, an information processing apparatus

comprising a mouse button set including a center button, a left button, and a right button.

Further, Claim 1 recites that “the mouse button set is located near an opposite end from the common button and the at least one cursor key in an axial direction of a hinge pin between the display and the keyboard.”

As explained in the original specification, for example, at page 21, lines 5-18, because of the positioning of the mouse button set, a user holding the information processing apparatus can perform different operations without moving his or her hands, so that operability of the apparatus is enhanced. Further, because the mouse button set is on an opposite end from the common button and the at least one cursor key, a user can perform operations with the mouse set, the common button, and the at least one cursor key at the same time without moving his or her hands. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

As noted in the first paragraph on page 7, “Unruh, as modified by Dow, Nakae, and Mak, fails to teach a mouse button set, including a center button configured to scroll a screen appearing on the display; a left button configured to operate as a first function button; and a right button configured to operate as a second function button.” Instead, the Office Action relies on Shiono to cure the above-noted deficiency of Unruh, as modified by Dow, Nakae, and Mak.

Applicants respectfully note that Shiono entered the national stage on August 6, 2004 and was published on August 25, 2005. Further, Shiono is the national stage application of PCT/JP02/10574, which was published on April 24, 2003 in Japanese. The present application claims priority to Japan Application No. 2003-035342, which was filed on February 13, 2003. Applicants submit herewith an English translation of Japan Application No. 2003-035342 and a statement that the translation is accurate. Because Shiono and its

international application were published after the filing date of Japan Application No. 2003-035342, Shiono is not prior art with respect to the present application.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the remaining secondary references (Harada, Fleck, Davies, and Blumberg) cure the above-noted deficiencies of Unruh, as modified by Dow, Nakae, and Mak. Regarding Fleck, Fleck describes positioning the mouse buttons (mouse assembly 112, left mouse button 310, and right mouse button 312) on opposite sides of the first portion 102 of the computer.<sup>1</sup> Thus, a user would have to use both hands to operate the mouse buttons of Fleck.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1, and all claims dependent thereon, are patentable over the cited references. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of Claim 1, and all claims dependent thereon, be withdrawn.

New Claims 10-14 are added by the present amendment. Support for new Claims 10-14 can be found in the original specification, for example, at page 9, line 23 to page 10, line 13, at page 19, line 9 to page 23, line 1, and in Figures 4-6. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

New Claims 10-14 depend on Claim 1, and thus are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1. Further, Claims 10-14 further define the mouse button set, and thus are believed to further patentably define over the cited references.


---

<sup>1</sup> See Fleck, column 6, lines 8-17 and in Figure 3.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

Colin B. Harris  
Registration No. 58,969